

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9-10, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Yamaki (U.S. 5,072,411). Applicant traverses this rejection on the grounds that this reference is defective in supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a).

Independent claims 1, 10 and 21 include:

Claim 1: A computer system comprising:

- a first video controller;
- a second video controller;
- a first display device;
- a second display device;
- a switching device configured to receive different signals from the video controllers and to provide each of the signals to a compatible one of the display devices;
- a chipset that includes the first video controller and the switching device, wherein the second video controller is coupled to the chipset;
- the switching device being coupled to a first connector configured to receive the first display device; and
- the switching device being coupled to a second connector configured to receive the second display device.

Claim 10: A computer system comprising:

- a first video controller;
- an interface configured to receive a second video controller;
- a first and a second display device;

a switching device coupled to receive different signals from the video controllers and to provide each of the signals to a compatible one of the display devices;

a chipset including the first video controller and the switching device, the interface being coupled to the chipset;

the switching device being coupled to a first connector configured to receive the first display device; and

the switching device being coupled to a second connector configured to receive the second display device.

Claim 21: A method of providing a video signal to a display device in a scalable platform comprising:

providing a first video controller;

providing a first and a second display device;

configuring an interface to receive a second video controller;

coupling a switching device to the first video controller and the interface;

providing a chipset including the first video controller and the switching device, the interface being coupled to the chipset;

coupling the switching device to a first connector configured to receive the first display device; and

coupling the switching device to a second connector configured to receive the second display device; and

configuring the switching device to receive different signals from the video controllers and to provide each of the signals to a compatible one of the display devices.

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131... "To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...". Therefore, to sustain this rejection the Yamaki

patent must contain all of the claimed elements of claims 1, 10 and 21. However, the claimed computer system and method are not shown or taught in the *Yamaki* patent as in receiving different signals and directing each signal to a compatible display device. Therefore, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, contained in the ...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The reference does not teach every element of the claims. Therefore, claims 1, 10 and 21 are submitted to be allowable.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamaki* (U.S. 5,072,411) in view of *Behrbaum et al.* (U.S. 6,326,973). Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamaki* in view of *Westberg et al.* (U.S. 4,862,156). Applicant traverses these rejections on the grounds that these references are defective in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As the PTO recognizes in MPEP § 2142:

...The Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. If the Examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the Applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness....the Examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical ‘person of ordinary skill in the art’ when the invention was unknown and just before it was made....The Examiner must put aside knowledge of the Applicant’s disclosure, refrain from using hindsight, and consider the subject matter claimed ‘as a whole.’”

The references fail to disclose or suggest the unique combination and interconnections of video controllers, display devices, chipset and switching device as claimed, and fail to teach receiving different signals and provide each of the signals to a compatible display device.

Therefore, there is simply no basis in the art for combining the references to support a 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection because neither the *Yamaki, Westberg et al.* nor *Behrbaum et al.* patents teach or even suggest the desirability of the combination. Moreover, neither patent provides any incentive or motivation supporting the desirability of the combination.

The MPEP §2143.01 provides:

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, the Examiner's combination arises solely from hindsight based on the invention without any showing of suggestion, incentive or motivation in either reference for the combination.

Thus, the Examiner's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness has clearly not been met.

The Federal Circuit has, on many occasions, held that was no basis for combining references to support a 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection. For example, in *In re Geiger*, the court stated in holding that the PTO " failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness":

Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Monteffore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The Federal Circuit has also repeatedly warned against using the applicant's disclosure as a blueprint to reconstruct the claimed invention out of isolated teachings in the prior art. See, e.g., *Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Products*, 840 F.2d 902, 907, 5 USPQ2d 1798, 1792 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

More recently, the Federal Circuit found motivation absent in *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998). In this case, the court concluded that the board had "reversibly erred in determining that one of [ordinary] skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these references in a manner that rendered the claimed invention [to have been] obvious." The court noted that to "prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, this court requires the examiner to show a motivation to combine the references that create the case of obviousness." The court further noted that there were three possible sources for such motivation, namely "(1) the nature of the problem to be solved: (2) the teachings of the prior art; and (3) the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art." Here, according to the court, the board had relied simply upon "the high level of skill in the art to provide the necessary motivation," without explaining what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested the combination. Notably, the court wrote: "If such a rote invocation could suffice to supply a motivation to combine, the more sophisticated scientific fields would rarely, if ever, experience a patentable technical advance."

Therefore, independent claims 1, 10 and 21 and the claims dependent therefrom are submitted to be allowable.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, 6, 9-10, 13-15, 18 and 21 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Bell
Registration No. 26,528

Dated: 10-23-03

HAYNES AND BOONE, L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 512/867-8407
Facsimile: 512/867-8470

A-154724.1

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
on	<u>10/23/03</u>
Date	<u>MH</u>
Signature	<u>Nishi Patarya</u>
Typed or Printed name of person signing Certificate	